



VICTORIA UNIVERSITY
MELBOURNE AUSTRALIA

Comparing event attendees and their telecast audiences: A case study of a commemorative event

This is the Published version of the following publication

Hede, Anne-Marie, Thyne, Maree, Josiassen, Alexander and Garma, Romana (2018) Comparing event attendees and their telecast audiences: A case study of a commemorative event. *Event Management*, 22 (4). pp. 555-569. ISSN 1525-9951

The publisher's official version can be found at

Note that access to this version may require subscription.

Downloaded from VU Research Repository <https://vuir.vu.edu.au/37916/>

COMPARING EVENT ATTENDEES AND THEIR TELECAST AUDIENCES: A CASE STUDY OF A COMMEMORATIVE EVENT

ANNE-MARIE HEDE,* MAREE THYNE,† ALEXANDER JOSIASSEN,‡ AND ROMANA GARMA§

*VU Research, Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia

†Department of Marketing, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

‡Department of Marketing, Copenhagen Business School, Frederiksberg, Copenhagen, Denmark

§College of Business, Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia

Attendees who are physically present at events are not the only consumers of events. Indeed, in many cases, the number of people who watch an event via its telecast far exceeds the number of people attending the event. In this context, gaining information about event telecast audiences is as critical as gaining information about event attendees. However, most of the research undertaken on understanding event consumers has focused on attendees who are physically present at events. Very little is known about how consumers of the telecasts of events compare with attendees at events. This research aimed to address this knowledge gap and identify whether consumers of a telecast event were similar to, or different from, those consumers who attend events in person in terms of their demographics, psychographics, and behavioral intentions. The focal event for this study was a large-scale national commemorative event in Australia and New Zealand. Data were collected using an online questionnaire from a purposive sample ($n = 1,152$) comprising both Australian (58%) and New Zealand (42%) residents, of which 580 of the entire sample were attendees at the event and 572 participated in the event via their telecasts. The results show that the two cohorts (1: event attendees and 2: event telecast participants) with an interest in the event show significant differences. Event attendees and event telecast participants are different in terms of gender, experience with the event/telecast (first-time participation, number of prior events, and number in party), motivations, emotions experienced, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions regarding the event/telecast. However, the two cohorts did not differ on age, education, household income, or their levels of patriotism. This study contributes to the event management literature as it extends our knowledge of consumers of events and provides a comparative analysis of event attendees and event telecast participants of a large-scale event. These findings provide valuable insights for event and telecast planners as well as other stakeholders about the two cohorts of event participants. The study is novel because it reports on data collected from both Australians and New Zealanders about this event rather than focusing on just one country, as previous research has tended to do.

Key words: Large-scale events; Commemorative events; Event attendees; Event telecast; Event telecast consumers; Motivations; Patriotism; Anzac Day

Introduction

In many circumstances, the number of people who watch the telecasts of large-scale events, particularly mega-, hallmark, and commemorative events, surpasses the number of people attending those same events. For example, in 2012, while there were 8.8 million tickets for the London Olympic Games, more than 219 million viewers watched their telecast, making it the most watched television event in American history (International Olympic Committee [IOC], 2013). The 3.9 billion viewers of the 2015 Tour de France telecast (Australian Broadcasting Corporation, 2015) far outstripped the number of those who watched the 22-day race along the 3,360.3 km route from Utrecht in the Netherlands to Paris, France, and each year, the Eurovision Song Contest has around 20,000 people physically attending the event, while around 200 million people view the event live via its telecast.

A number of reasons can be proffered for watching a telecast of an event over attending the event. Even when someone is motivated to attend an event, both intrapersonal and structural barriers (Santos-Lewis & Moital, 2013) can preclude attendance. There may be limitations on the supply of tickets to the event or it may be costly, inconvenient, or time consuming to access an event. Additional costs, such as those relating to travel or accommodation, may prohibit event attendance. At crowded events, such as many mega-, hallmark, and commemorative events, the “psychological burden associated with overcapacity” (Mowen, Vogelsong, & Graefe, 2003, p. 70) may act as a barrier to attending. Indeed, studies in marketing and social psychology show that most individuals do not view crowding positively (Machleit, Eroglu, & Mantel, 2000). Further, the recent works of W. Kim, Jun, Walker, and Drane (2015) and Skoll and Korstanje (2014), highlighted that terrorism and increased feelings of anxiety about event attendance may now also be compounding some of the more typical barriers to attending events.

Notwithstanding these considerations, watching a telecast is an appealing activity for many consumers. Although Katz (1996) suggested that television has all but ceased to function as a “public place,” the telecasts of large-scale events, such as mega-

hallmark, and commemorative events, are popular with consumers. Increasingly, events are watched on several platforms such as computers, mobile devices, and big screens making them a significant extension of the event market offering. Indeed, Rothenbuhler (1988) concluded that watching the telecasts of events is a valued social activity, noting that it is usually a communal experience partaken with family members and friends. In the case of sporting events, Gantz and Wenner (1995) suggested that viewership is likely to be active and participatory, providing an opportunity for shared experiences, feelings of togetherness, and to even feel the same emotions of those attending the televised event.

Research and industry attention has been directed towards examining event telecasts; however, much of this has been focused on their role in relation to destination marketing and whether they induce tourism to host destinations. For example, Chalip and Costa (2005) compared the role of advertising and event media on a host destination’s image; Hede (2006) investigated the role of the 2004 Olympic Games’ telecast on potential tourism from Australia to Greece; and Green, Costa, and Fitzgerald (2003) investigated the prevalence of the host destination’s name in the telecast of a large and nationally significant sporting event, making recommendations as to how to improve the efficacy of this type of media exposure to induce tourism to the host destination. Ritchie, Sanders, and Mules (2007) compared the perceptions consumers of a televised commemorative event had on the host destination, concluding that the cognitive component of the host destination image influences the affective component of the host destination’s image.

Given the importance of event telecasts, it is valuable to understand their consumers—and how they are similar or different to consumers who physically attend events. An in-depth analysis of these two event participant cohorts will allow event managers and telecast and media planners to better allocate their resources, with improved participant experiences and business performance as consequences. Indeed, we argue that gaining information about the consumers of event telecasts is as critical as gaining information about event attendees. Hence, the research question for this study was: Do the audiences for the telecasts

of events differ from their event attendee counterparts? Our comparative analysis focused on how these two consumer groups compare in terms of their demographics, psychographics, and behavioral intentions.

The study context is a large-scale heritage commemoration, Anzac Day, which is the national day of remembrance, in both Australia and New Zealand, for all soldiers under Australian and New Zealand command who were killed in war. Anzac Day specifically commemorates the landing of the ANZACs (Australia and New Zealand Army Corps) at Gallipoli, Turkey, on April 25, 1915. Heritage commemorations, like Anzac Day, have been described as “memorial services, specific ceremonies or broader events (even festivals) designed to honour the memory of someone or something” (Getz, 2007, p. 73). Anzac Day events are held at local shrines, cenotaphs, in halls, parks, schools, and even on local beaches, and increasingly the live telecasts of local events, as well as those overseas, have garnered considerable patronage. We draw upon survey data ($n = 1,152$) collected from Australian and New Zealand residents who were either physically present at an Anzac Day event ($n = 572$) or who were attendees of an event via a telecast ($n = 580$).

The article proceeds to contextualize this research with a review of the literature on heritage commemorations, and some specific information about Anzac Day. We then focus our literature review on event motivations, experiences, and postconsumption attitudes. Next, the details of the method are provided; we present our results and discuss their implications for event management. Finally, we outline the limitations of our study and make recommendations for further research for event management.

Background

Heritage Commemorations

Heritage commemorations “are marked in the context of national days, birthdays of kings and queens, battles or wars (through Remembrance Days)” (Getz, 2007, p. 34). Chronis (2005) concluded that the ever present national identity aligned with commemorative events, enhances what Turner

(1986) termed the “consciousness of kind” and “strengthens the unity of the nation.” Frost (2012) noted that national governments are interested in sponsoring and staging commemorations of independence and/or nationhood not only to attract tourists but to promote their national identities. Frew and White (2015) noted that while commemorative events may vary in style around the world, they all go some way to express a nation’s identity, or the “set of meanings” owned by a given culture, which sets it apart from other cultures (Keillor & Hult, 1999).

Durkheim (1995) remarked that the integral role of ritual commemoration “at regular intervals is to maintain and strengthen the collective feelings and ideas” (p. 429). In this context, heritage commemorations play both functional and symbolic roles in society. Frost and Laing (2013) highlighted that although commemorative events, such as Anzac Day, are designed to affirm national identities through national discourses and collective memories, dissonance often surrounds them. Despite this, Spilling (1998) noted that “regardless of institutional forces, something intrinsic to the meaning of some past events generates their sustained collective memory” (p. 127). Indeed, Foote and Azaryahu (2007) viewed commemorations of events, people, and places as fundamental elements of most traditions of public memory. White (1997) suggested that acts of remembrance actively reproduce national sentiments and identities with the mass mediated representations further projecting them outward to broader publics. However, Uzzell (1989) cautioned that the outcomes of such commemorations may be damaging if great care is not exercised to achieve a satisfactory blend of academic rigor, information communication, enlightenment, and entertainment.

Attendees of Commemorative Events

With the extant body of literature on events, we can garner a great deal of information about attendees of various commemorative events with regard to their motivations, experiences, and postconsumption attitudes. For example, according to Henderson (2007), visitors and attendees of battlefields and commemorative events “exhibit a variety of motivations, occupying positions on a continuum from the frivolous and possibly voyeuristic

to the extremely serious, with war veterans being an important market" (p. 38). Hyde and Harman (2011) found that visitors to Anzac Day events in Turkey were primarily motivated by nationalistic motivations: they were proud of their country, they believed what happened at Gallipoli represents the best values of their country, they wanted to pay respects to the soldiers who fought for their country, and they wanted to experience the "real" Anzac Day. Winter (2012) found that national connections were particularly important for those visitors who did not have family connections to the commemorative focus. Hall, Basarin, and Lockstone-Binney (2011) identified five motivational domains relevant to a visit to Anzac Day events at Gallipoli, namely "mourn," "affirm," "remember," "external," and "battlefield." A review of the items for the motivational domains suggests that they are highly relevant to the battlefield context but perhaps less so to attendance at commemorative events at more general venues, such as parks, cenotaphs, town halls, museums, sports stadium, and returned services venues, where most Australian and New Zealanders attend Anzac Day events.

With this in mind, it is important to note that the earliest work on motivations for event attendance (e.g., Backman, Backman, Muzaffer, & Mohr Sunshine, 1995; Crompton & McKay, 1997; Ryan & Bates, 1995) identified that escapism, socialization, novelty, curiosity, and family togetherness were all applicable motivations. Matheson, Rimmer, and Tinsley (2014) suggested that it is not surprising that these domains continue to be validated in contemporary research, given the pervasive use of their various scales associated with them. Although some researchers have sought to establish new motivational domains for specific types of events, escapism, socialization, novelty, curiosity, and family togetherness have variously emerged in these studies [see for example, Tkaczynski & Toh (2014) or S. Kim, Savinovic, & Brown (2013)]. In their comparative study across six different types of festivals, Yolal, Woo, Cetinel, and Uysal (2012) concluded that even in the same festival, event attendees can be motivated by different aspects of the event. Hence, the use of generic rather than context-specific motivational domains are most likely able to offer greater opportunity for comparative analysis for event management.

In terms of event experiences, attendance at commemorative events and destinations evoke a range of positively- and negatively-valenced emotions (Hede & Hall, 2012). Using Pearl Harbor commemorations as a case study, White (1997) found that attendees were mostly saddened by their participation but also proud, with comparatively fewer attendees reporting to be angry. White (1997) attributed this finding to the lapsing of time since the World War II conflict, further highlighting that the differences in experiences may be based on what Hirsch (2008) referred to as first-, second-, or third-generation memories. In a qualitative study of battlefield tourists to the Somme, most of whom visited for an Anzac Day event, Cheal and Griffin (2013) reported that the tourist experience reaffirmed a sense of national pride—with pride being a positive emotion.

Using the thanatourism (Slade, 2003) or dark tourism (Lennon & Foley, 2000) literatures to frame research on commemorative events, attendees at Anzac Day events, and specifically those at destinations outside of Australia and New Zealand, have been described as "pilgrims" because of the journey that they might make as part of their attendance at heritage commemorative events (Birna, Hyde, Cheal, & Griffin, 2013; Digance, 2003). They have additionally been described as "patriots" (Cheal & Griffin, 2013). As patriotism is interpreted as a love of one's country rather than the rejection of other nations or the sense that one's country is superior (Balabanis, Diamantopoulos, Mueller, & Melewar, 2001) it is considered to be a "healthy national self-concept" (Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989), and appears to be highly relevant to attendees of commemorative events. As patriotism has been included in previous studies within consumer behavior particularly in relation to consumer ethnocentrism (Balabanis et al., 2001; Sharma, Shimp, & Shin, 1995); country of origin (Han & Terpstra, 1988; Lusk et al., 2006); willingness to buy domestic products (He & Wang, 2015; Wang & Chen, 2004); and perceptions of product quality, we suggest that patriotism will be a useful construct to profile participants of events, particularly those that are focused on a nation's history. In making comparisons between event attendees and telecast audiences for events, we suggest that event attendees are likely to be more patriotic than their telecast

counterparts and the emotions experienced at the event will be more intense than those experienced when watching the event.

With the literature on event attendees reviewed, we proceed to provide the details of the method we employed to compare the profiles of the two cohorts.

Research Methods

As our research was aimed at exploring whether the audiences for the telecasts of events differ from their event attendee counterparts, Anzac Day events were deemed to be an appropriate context for this study. There are two clearly identifiable cohorts of participants in Anzac Day events—event attendees and event telecast participants. In order to understand and compare these two cohorts, we investigated their profiles, antecedents to consumption, their consumption experiences, and their postconsumption behavioral intentions. More specifically, we tested for differences and similarities in demographics (age, gender, household income, and education); the number people in the attendance/audience party; experience with the event (prior participation); and for differences in the following constructs: motivations for participation; levels of patriotism, emotions experienced; satisfaction; and behavioral intentions. A quantitative approach, using an online questionnaire, was deemed appropriate for the study to capture a cross-section of the population.

Data were collected shortly after Anzac Day 2015 through an online survey, which was developed in Qualtrics and hosted by one of the universities conducting the study. Participants were sourced from consumer panels convened by two professional market research agencies, one in Australia and the other in New Zealand, and were paid the market rate by the agencies for their participation in the survey. Participants in the survey were required to be over 18 years of age and both agencies sought to ensure the samples were similar to the national profiles with regard to demographics. Participants in the survey, who were all citizens of either Australia or New Zealand, needed to have either attended a 2015 Anzac Day event and/or watched a 2015 event via a telecast. As such, the sample was convenient but purposive. All respondents were asked to nominate which event they attended

or which telecast they watched; this requirement assisted to ensure the integrity of the data. In the case of a respondent indicating that they had both attended an event and watched a telecast, they were asked to nominate whether they would prefer to focus their responses as an attendee of the event or as an audience member of a telecast of the event. Respondents were routed to the set of questions that specifically applied to them. Once a respondent completed the questionnaire a trigger e-mail was sent back to the market research agencies in order for them to compensate the respondents. At no time did the researchers have direct contact with the members of the panels. Respondents remained anonymous.

Previously validated measures for the constructs of interest were employed for the questionnaire. Motivations for participation were measured using items developed by Uysal, Gahan, and Martin (1993) with the addition of one context-specific motivation statement: "It was important for me to participate in the Anzac Day Centenary event." We also surveyed for levels of patriotism (Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989) and emotions experienced (Russell & Mehrabian, 1977), which the literature suggests are both highly relevant to the consumption of commemorative events.

Consumer satisfaction (Mimouni-Chaabane & Volle, 2010) and behavioral intentions (repeat attendance, willingness to recommend, and willingness to pay) with regard to participation in Anzac Day events in the future were also measured. All items were assessed for clarity and modified to ensure the wording was unambiguous with regard to the focus of the questionnaire for each cohort; that is, participation at the event or participation as an audience member of the telecast of the event. Data were collected on demographics (age, gender, education, and household education) and experience with the event (prior participation and number in the party). The data on demographics and prior participation were categorical; the data on emotions were collected using semantic differentials; and all other data were collected using a 5- or 7-point Likert scale.

Results and Discussion

After cleaning the data for outliers and cases with response patterns that demonstrated social

desirability, the final sample was $n = 1,152$. The split between country of residence was 41.6% from New Zealand and 58.4% from Australia and there was an even split within each country between the two attendee cohorts. Thus, the data set includes two independent samples: a cohort of attendees of an Anzac Day event and another cohort of audience members of a telecast of an Anzac Day event. In this section, we report on the results of the comparative analysis of the cohorts in relation to their demographic profile, experience with Anzac Day events, level of patriotism, motivations for participation, emotions experienced, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions.

Demographics

Table 1 presents the results of the comparative analysis between the two cohorts with regard to demographics. As all the demographic variables were categorical, cross-tabulations were used to explore for statistically significant differences between the two cohorts. Although Table 1 shows that none

of the differences between the two independent samples are statistically different, the descriptive statistics highlight that in terms of age, the majority of both cohorts are aged 45 years or over; more women watched a telecast than women who attended an event; more men attended an event than women; only around 13% in each cohort were qualified to the postgraduate level; and the combined household income of around 54% of both cohorts was less than AU/NZ\$78,000 per annum. Both cohorts in our study comprise around 35% who were 44 years of age or less. This result differs from the profiles of respondents in studies on Anzac Day events in France and Turkey. For example, Winter (2012) reported that 20% of the visitors to Anzac Day events in France in 2011 were less than 39 years of age. The profile of both cohorts in our study differ markedly from attendees at, for example, the 2007 Anzac Day event in Turkey, of which 73% were 18–30 years of age (Hall et al., 2010) and were predominantly (58%) female. They are similarly different from the profile of battlefield visitors (59% female and 59% aged 18–30 years of age).

Table 1
Demographics

| | Attendee Cohort | Telecast Cohort | Total | ² | Sig. |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-------|--------------|-------|
| Age | | | | 6.58 | 0.09 |
| 18–24 years | (83) 14.3% | (58) 10.1% | 141 | | |
| 25–44 years | (123) 21.2% | (141) 24.7% | 264 | | |
| 45–64 years | (168) 29.0% | (181) 31.6% | 349 | | |
| 65+ years | (206) 35.5% | (192) 33.6% | 39 | | |
| Total | 580 | 572 | 1,152 | | |
| Gender | | | | 5.84 | 0.02* |
| Male | (311) 53.6% | (266) 46.5% | 577 | | |
| Female | (269) 46.4% | (306) 53.5% | 575 | | |
| Total | 580 | 572 | 1,152 | | |
| Education (%) | | | | 0.85 | 0.84 |
| Secondary | (190) 32.8% | (188) 32.9% | 378 | | |
| TAFE/Polytechnic | (181) 31.2% | (166) 29.0% | 347 | | |
| Undergraduate | (131) 22.6% | (139) 24.3% | 270 | | |
| Postgraduate | (78) 13.4% | (79) 13.8% | 157 | | |
| Total | 580 | 572 | 1,152 | | |
| Household income | | | | 0.26 | 1.0 |
| Less than \$26,000 | (70) 12.1% | (71) 12.4% | 141 | | |
| \$26,000 or more but less than \$52,000 | (155) 26.7% | (150) 26.2% | 305 | | |
| \$52,000 or more but less than \$78,000 | (90) 15.5% | (92) 16.1% | 182 | | |
| \$78,000 or more per less than \$104,000 | (81) 14.0% | (78) 13.6% | 159 | | |
| \$104,000 or more and less than \$130,000 | (60) 10.3% | (56) 9.8% | 116 | | |
| \$130,000 plus | (64) 11.0% | (64) 11.2% | 128 | | |
| Declined to answer | (60) 10.3% | (61) 10.7% | 121 | | |
| Total | 580 | 572 | 1,152 | | |

*Significance is at the 0.05 level.

Experience With Anzac Day Events/Telecasts

To compare for differences between the two cohorts in terms of their prior experience with Anzac Day events/telecasts, we conducted a cross-tabulation. Table 2 shows that for 17.4% of attendee cohort it was the first time that they had attended an Anzac Day event. In comparison, for 29.5% of the telecast cohort, 2015 was the first time that they had watched a telecast of an Anzac Day event. These differences were statistically significant [$\chi^2(1, N = 1,152) = 23.62, p = 0.00$]. In terms of the number of events (i.e., events or telecasts) that respondents had attended/watched, the results show that a larger percentage of the attendee cohort had attended a greater number of Anzac Day events than was the case for the telecast cohort. These differences were statistically significant [$\chi^2(1, N = 1,152) = 13.74, p = 0.00$]. The mean number in the group attending/viewing the event/telecast was 2.7 and 1.8, respectively [$t(1,150) = 15.01, p = 0.00$].

Patriotism

At the outset of this research, we expected that the attendee cohort would have stronger levels of patriotism than their telecast counterparts because it was thought that attending an event requires more of an investment on the behalf of consumers than

watching a telecast of a national commemorative event. For ease of interpretation, the negatively worded items (see Table 3, Items 1–5) on the patriotism scale were reverse scored. This procedure does not impact the results of any subsequent tests. The results indicate that each of the cohorts' levels of patriotism is similar. Table 3 presents the means for each of the cohorts on all the patriotism items and shows that differences between the two cohorts are not statistically significant. These results indicate that rather than the two cohorts being independent in terms of their levels of patriotism, they are homogenous.

Attendees of commemorative events, particularly those at battlefields in France and Turkey, have been described as "pilgrims" (Birna et al., 2013; Cheal & Griffin, 2013; Digance, 2003); however, Cheal (2013) also described these consumers as patriots. Given the strong levels of agreement that respondents in our survey had with all of the patriotism items, and the homogeneity of the two cohorts, we suggest that this latter term also applies to both cohorts in our study. Although the Chair of Adelaide's Anzac Day Committee cautioned the hijacking of Australia's military heritage for jingoism, overt nationalism, as well as misguided patriotism (Australian Broadcasting Corporation., 2015), media images projected attendees as being emotional, mostly solemn, and many draped in their

Table 2
Event Participation

| | Attendee Cohort | Telecast Cohort | Total | χ^2/t^a | Sig. |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-------|--------------------|-------|
| First-time participation | | | | 23.62 | 0.00* |
| Yes | (101) 17.4% | (169) 29.5% | 270 | | |
| No | (479) 82.6 % | (403) 70.5% | 892 | | |
| Total | 580 | 572 | 1,152 | | |
| Number of prior events (n = 882) | | | | 13.74 | 0.00* |
| 1 | (27) 5.6% | (16) 4.0% | 43 | | |
| 2–5 | (131) 27.3% | (157) 39.0% | 288 | | |
| 6 plus | (321) 67.0% | (230) 57.1% | 555 | | |
| Total | 479 | 403 | 882 | | |
| Number in the group | <i>M</i> = 2.68 | <i>M</i> = 1.78 | | 15.07 ^b | 0.00* |
| 1 | (106) 18.3% | (239) 41.8% | 345 | | |
| 2 | (191) 32.9% | (254) 44.4% | 445 | | |
| 3 | (65) 11.2% | (42) 7.3% | 107 | | |
| 4 | (218) 37.6% | (37) 6.5% | 255 | | |
| Total | 580 | 572 | 1,152 | | |

Note. ^a*df* = 1,150; ^b*t* value.

*Significance is at the 0.05 level.

Table 3
Patriotism

| | Attendee Cohort (n = 580) | Telecast Cohort (n = 572) | All (n = 1,152) | t | Sig. |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|-------|------|
| 1. In general, I have very little respect for the Australian/ New Zealand people ^a | 6.41 | 6.45 | 6.43 | -0.55 | 0.59 |
| 2. Australia/New Zealand is just an institution ^a | 6.34 | 6.34 | 6.34 | 0.01 | 0.99 |
| 3. It bothers me to see children pledge allegiance to the flag or sing the national anthem or otherwise induce strong patriotic attitudes ^a | 6.09 | 6.13 | 6.11 | -0.61 | 0.54 |
| 4. It is not constructive for one to develop an emotional attachment to one's country ^a | 6.02 | 6.06 | 6.04 | -0.59 | 0.55 |
| 5. It is not important for me to serve Australia/New Zealand ^a | 5.69 | 5.61 | 5.64 | 1.03 | 0.30 |
| 6. I'm proud to be in Australian/New Zealand | 4.66 | 4.61 | 4.64 | 1.14 | 0.25 |
| 7. I love my Australia/New Zealand | 4.64 | 4.60 | 4.62 | 1.08 | 0.28 |
| 8. I feel great pride in the land is our Australia/New Zealand | 4.53 | 4.48 | 4.51 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| 9. The fact that I am an Australian/New Zealander is an important part of my identity | 4.44 | 4.37 | 4.41 | 1.35 | 0.18 |
| 10. Although at times I may not agree with the government, my commitment to Australia/New Zealand always remain strong | 4.40 | 4.40 | 4.40 | 0.11 | 0.92 |
| 11. I am emotionally attached my Australia/New Zealand and emotionally affected by the actions | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 0.09 | 0.93 |
| 12. When I see the Australian/New Zealand flag flying I feel great | 4.05 | 3.42 | 4.03 | 0.55 | 0.58 |

Note. ^aReversed scored.

country's flag or wearing nationalistic apparel. Hyde and Harman (2011) found that visitors to Anzac Day events in Turkey held nationalistic motivations. Our findings suggest that patriotic attitudes (i.e., a love of Australia and New Zealand) rather than a perception of superiority of their nations were likely to impact their consumption behavior.

Motivations

Table 4 presents the results of the independent samples *t* tests for all of the items on Uysal et al.'s (1993) scale to measure motivations for attending events, as well as the context-specific motivation statement: *It was important for me to participate in the Anzac Day Centenary event*. The 20 items on the motivational scale were grouped together around the motivational domains identified in Yolal et al.'s (2012) study across six different events. As can be seen in Table 4, the differences in the means for the attendee cohort and the telecast cohort for all the items on the motivational scale vary in their importance between the two cohorts and in their statistical significance. Overall, the mean scores for the items

on "novelty" motivational domain were higher for the telecast cohort. This result may be a reflection of the larger proportion of first-time participants in the telecast cohort as compared with the attendee cohort. However, *I enjoy special events* was the only one of the three items where the differences were statistically significant [Attendee cohort/telecast cohort $M = 3.2/3.4$; $t(1,150) = 11.04$, $p = 0.03$].

In terms of "family togetherness," the differences between the means for the two cohorts were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) for all three items with the attendee cohort reporting stronger motivations for all the items relating to this motivational domain. Similarly, the attendee cohort reported stronger motivations ($p < 0.05$) for the four items that involve interactions with others/socialization: *To be people with similar interests*; *To be with people who enjoy the same things I do*; *So, I can be with my friends*; and *For a chance to be with people who are enjoying themselves*. Although we did not ask respondents to indicate who they participated the event with, we did ask how many people were in their consumption parties (mean number in the group was 2.7 for the attendee cohort and 1.8 for

Table 4
Motivations

| | Attendee Cohort (n = 580) | Telecast Cohort (n = 572) | All (n = 1,152) | t | Sig. |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|--------|-------|
| Novelty | | | | | |
| 1. Anzac Day events are unique | 3.50 | 3.59 | 3.54 | 11.04 | 0.16 |
| 2. I enjoy special events | 3.24 | 3.39 | 3.31 | 6.85 | 0.03* |
| 3. I like the variety of things to see and do | 3.16 | 3.29 | 3.22 | 6.68 | 0.07 |
| <i>Summated Mean (Rank among averages of motivational domains)</i> | <i>3.30 (1)</i> | <i>3.42 (1)</i> | <i>3.36</i> | | |
| Family togetherness | | | | | |
| 4. This event is a good event for families to attend together | 3.74 | 3.40 | 3.57 | 2.70 | 0.00* |
| 5. So, the family could do something together | 2.86 | 2.60 | 2.73 | 1.20 | 0.00* |
| 6. I thought the entire family would enjoy it | 2.80 | 2.64 | 2.72 | 0.70 | 0.03* |
| <i>Summated Mean (Rank among averages of motivational domains)</i> | <i>3.13 (2)</i> | <i>2.88 (4)</i> | <i>3.00</i> | | |
| Excitement | | | | | |
| 7. To experience the event myself | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.11 | 2.02 | 0.45 |
| 8. I thought it would be stimulating | 3.19 | 3.18 | 3.19 | 6.59 | 0.89 |
| 9. To experience new and different things | 2.70 | 2.90 | 2.80 | 26.65 | 0.01 |
| 10. I thought it would be exciting | 2.87 | 2.91 | 2.89 | 7.69 | 0.57 |
| 11. I was curious | 2.39 | 2.88 | 2.63 | 5.00 | 0.00* |
| <i>Summated Mean (Rank among averages of motivational domains)</i> | <i>3.06 (3)</i> | <i>3.19 (2)</i> | <i>3.12</i> | | |
| Socialization | | | | | |
| 12. To be with people similar interests | 3.55 | 3.22 | 3.39 | 4.69 | 0.00* |
| 13. To be with people who enjoy the same things I do | 3.04 | 2.78 | 2.91 | 3.62 | 0.00* |
| 14. So, I could be with my friends | 2.96 | 2.61 | 2.78 | 4.65 | 0.00* |
| 15. For a chance to be with people who are enjoying themselves | 2.74 | 2.58 | 2.66 | 2.23 | 0.03* |
| 16. I enjoy watching the crowds | 2.61 | 2.71 | 2.68 | -1.78 | 0.08 |
| 17. To observe the other people attending the event | 2.55 | 3.42 | 2.98 | -12.06 | 0.00* |
| <i>Summated Mean (Rank among averages of motivational domains)</i> | <i>2.91 (4)</i> | <i>2.89 (3)</i> | <i>2.9</i> | | |
| Escapism | | | | | |
| 18. To have a change from my daily routine | 2.50 | 2.67 | 2.59 | 9.94 | 0.02* |
| 19. For a change of pace from my everyday life | 2.46 | 2.61 | 2.53 | 5.73 | 0.04* |
| 20. To get away from the demands of life | 2.15 | 2.26 | 2.20 | 0.69 | 0.02* |
| <i>Summated Mean (Rank among averages of motivational domains)</i> | <i>2.37 (5)</i> | <i>2.51 (5)</i> | <i>2.44</i> | | |
| It was important for me to participate in the Centenary event | 4.45 | 4.16 | 4.31 | 4.80 | 0.00* |

*Significance is at the 0.05 level.

the telecast cohort). Both differences in the mean for the items on this scale that involve observations of others [*I enjoy watching the crowds* ($p > 0.05$) and *To observe other people attending the event* ($p < 0.05$)] were comparatively stronger for the telecast cohort as compared with your attendee cohort. These results suggest perhaps that the motivations for “family togetherness” and “socialization” are distinguishing features between the two cohorts.

In the case of the excitement motivational domain, the attendee cohort reported stronger levels for all the items on this domain, with the differences

in the means of: *to experience new and different things* and *I was curious* both significant ($p < 0.05$) and markedly stronger for the telecast cohort. The fact that nearly one third (29.5%) of the telecast cohort had not watched a telecast of an Anzac Day event before 2015 and that there was a large percentage (82.6%) of the attendee cohort who had attended an Anzac Day event before 2015 perhaps helps to explain this result. In terms of “escapism,” even though the strength of all three of the items was moderate (between 2.67 and 2.15), the telecast cohort reported that they were more strongly

motivated by the items in this domain ($p < 0.05$) than their attendee cohort counterpart.

Prior research on commemoration events indicates that participant experiences are emotionally intense (Hede & Hall, 2012) and that consumption around the notions of war and death may be confronting (Slade, 2003). Thus, it is possible that the attendee cohort (which had a high level of repeat attendance compared with the telecast cohort) viewed the event experience as an immersive one rather than an event that allowed them to escape the routines of their daily lives. On the other hand, Anzac Day in 2015 was held on a Saturday, which is typically a day of the week for many Australians and New Zealanders to partake in routine activities (such as shopping, housework, or sporting activities). However, in both Australia and New Zealand shops are closed until 1:00 pm on Anzac Day and sporting activities cannot commence until then as well. Hence, watching a telecast of an Anzac Day event may be considered as an opportunity to escape the routines of one's everyday life activities, which is a quintessential element of all special events (Getz, 1989).

As mentioned, to further assist in the interpretation of these data, the 20 items on the motivational scale were grouped together around the motivational domains identified in Yolal et al.'s (2012) study across six different events and the means for each of the motivational domains were calculated and then ranked for each of the cohorts. Based on the summated means for the motivational domains, "Novelty" was found to be the strongest motivational domain for both cohorts. This result supports Yolal et al.'s (2012) finding that a novelty motivational domain applies to event attendance regardless of the type of event. "Escapism" was the weakest of all the domains for both cohorts. This may be a function of the reflective rather than hedonistic nature of the event with its very specific focus on commemoration. However, there are differences between the two cohorts in the ranking of the three remaining motivational domains. For the attendee cohort, the order of the strength of the three remaining domains was: family togetherness, excitement, and socialization, but for the telecast cohort, the order of the strength of the three remaining domains was: excitement, socialization, and family togetherness.

Finally, the difference in the means for attendee cohort ($M = 4.45$, $SD = 0.90$) and the telecast cohort ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 0.96$) was statistically significant [$t(1,150) = 5.27$, $p = 0.00$] for the item: *It was important for me to participate in the Anzac Day Centenary event*. Singularly, this was the strongest of all the motivational items across the two cohorts.

Emotions

Using Russell and Mehrabian's (1977) semantic differential scale, we measured respondents' emotional responses to their participation in an Anzac Day event/telecast. Respondents were asked to provide their response to a series of paired statements, namely unaroused/aroused; relaxed/stimulated; sleepy/awake; calm/excited; unhappy/happy; annoyed/pleased; dissatisfied/satisfied; and despairing/hopeful, which were placed on a 5-point semantic differential scale. As can be seen from Table 5, the mean scores for both groups for all the emotions were positively valenced, with the least positively valenced emotions unhappy/happy [Attendee/telecast cohort: $M = 3.6/3.4$, $SD = 1.0/1.0$; $t(1,150) = 4.03$, $p = 0.00$] and calm/excited [Attendee/telecast cohort: $M = 3.1/3.0$, $SD = 1.2/1.1$; $t(1,150) = 2.0$, $p = 0.05$]. Although these particular results for unhappy/happy and calm/excited may be a function of the solemnity of Anzac Day, both cohorts indicated that their event experiences were emotionally positive with the attendee cohort indicating that their experiences were, in comparison, more emotionally positive than those of their telecast counterparts. Research on emotions indicates that participants experience both positive and negative emotions simultaneously; however, the valence of the emotions that we surveyed our participants on were all positive for both the attendee and telecast cohorts. These findings go some way to supporting Gantz and Wenner's view (1995) in the case of sporting events, that telecasts provide opportunities for viewers to even feel the same emotions of those attending the event.

Satisfaction and Behavioral Intentions

Tables 6 and 7 present the results of the independent samples t tests for the three items on Mimouni-Chaabane's (2010) modified scale for satisfaction

Table 5
Emotions Experienced

| | Attendee Cohort (<i>n</i> = 580) | Telecast Cohort (<i>n</i> = 572) | All (<i>n</i> = 1,152) | <i>t</i> | Sig. |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------|-------|
| Dissatisfied/satisfied | 4.13 (1) | 3.85 (1) | 3.99 | 4.71 | 0.00* |
| Sleepy/awake | 4.12 (2) | 3.74 (2) | 3.93 | 5.80 | 0.00* |
| Annoyed/pleased | 3.99 (3) | 3.70 (4) | 3.85 | 4.56 | 0.00* |
| Despairing/hopeful | 3.99 (3) | 3.73 (3) | 3.86 | 4.40 | 0.00* |
| Unaroused/aroused | 3.78 (5) | 3.46 (5) | 3.62 | 4.88 | 0.00* |
| Relaxed/stimulated | 3.57 (6) | 3.24 (7) | 3.41 | 5.27 | 0.00* |
| Unhappy/happy | 3.63 (7) | 3.39 (6) | 3.51 | 4.83 | 0.00* |
| Calm/excited | 3.13 (8) | 2.99 (8) | 3.06 | 1.97 | 0.05* |

*Significance is at the 0.05 level.

and behavioral intentions in relation to future consumption of the event/telecast. Table 6 shows that the differences between the two cohorts were statistically different ($p < 0.05$) for all three satisfaction items and that the attendee cohort reported higher levels of satisfaction with their attendance than their telecast counterparts were satisfied with their telecast experience. As might be expected, given the high levels of satisfaction, it is not surprising that the three items to measure behavioral intentions (repeat consumption, recommending behavior, and willingness to pay) followed a similar pattern to the satisfaction ratings. The behavioral intentions of the attendee cohort when compared with the telecast cohort were all stronger than those of the telecast cohort with the differences statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

Conclusion

Attendees who are physically present at events are not the only consumers of events. In particular, large-scale events generally have a substantial audience for their telecasts who appear to enjoy this type of

event experience. Event telecasts are often an important element of an event's offering to the market. Additionally, some events may not be viable without the financial benefits of its telecast derived from sponsorship and advertising contractual agreements. Although profiling and understanding the attendees who are physically present at an event is important, gaining information about the audiences for event telecasts is also important. Indeed, we argue that gathering more information about the people who participate in an event via its telecast is, and in some cases potentially more, critical to the success of an event as it is gaining information about the people who physically attend an event. Yet, profiling and comparing the event telecast audiences with their attendee counterparts has been overlooked in the event management literature. This research aimed to address this gap in the literature and identify whether consumers of an event's telecast were similar to, or different from, those consumers who attended events in person in terms of their demographics, psychographics, and behavioral intentions.

Our analysis compared these two cohorts (attendee and telecast participants) at Anzac Day

Table 6
Satisfaction

| | Attendee Cohort (<i>n</i> = 580) | Telecast Cohort (<i>n</i> = 572) | All (<i>n</i> = 1,152) | <i>t</i> | Sig. |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------|-------|
| Remove From Final | | | | | |
| I made a good choice when I decided to participate in this Anzac Day event | 4.47 | 4.13 | 4.30 | 6.82 | 0.00* |
| My evaluation of my participation at Anzac Day event was good | 4.40 | 3.97 | 4.19 | 8.32 | 0.00* |
| All in all, I was satisfied with my experience at with this Anzac Day event/telecast | 4.40 | 4.14 | 4.27 | 5.09 | 0.00* |

*Significance is at the 0.05 level.

Table 7
Behavioral Intentions

| | Attendee Cohort (<i>n</i> = 580) | Telecast Cohort (<i>n</i> = 572) | All (<i>n</i> = 1,152) | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> Value |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------|----------------|
| I will attend/watch Anzac Day events in the future | 4.41 | 3.42 | 3.92 | 6.77 | 0.00* |
| I will recommend others to attend Anzac Day events/telecast in the future | 4.31 | 3.59 | 3.95 | 2.26 | 0.00* |
| I am willing to pay to attend Anzac Day events/telecast in the future | 2.97 | 2.71 | 2.4 | 0.122 | 0.00* |

*Significance is at the 0.05 level.

2015 in relation to demographics, psychographics, experiences, and postconsumption behavioral intentions. Results revealed significant differences between the groups in terms of their experience with the event (first-time participation, number of prior events, and number in party), intensity of emotions, motivations, satisfaction, and event-related behavioral intentions in the future. On only a few of the investigated variables (age, education, household income, or their levels of patriotism) were no statistically significant differences found. The results provide a comprehensive overview of each of the cohorts in terms of their demographics, psychographics, experiences, and postconsumption attitudes. In addition to the comparative analysis that we undertook, we were able to make some descriptive comparisons with what we know about participants of Anzac Day events based on prior research in this area. We suggest that the profiles of both our cohorts differ from that of the profile of participants at commemorative events held on battlefield sites and near memorials.

Given the significance of Anzac Day for Australia and New Zealand and the stage of its existence, the information we garnered from the data provides insights for how the event can be managed and developed in to the future. Even though growing the market for the Anzac Day telecasts will help to engage a larger audience in Anzac Day, the events themselves appear to be in a challenging situation: there are fewer first-time participants at Anzac Day events as compared to the telecast and even though the two cohorts are similar in terms of their demographics, what is of concern for the event is that both the events and the telecasts are attracting a comparatively older demographic. As the telecast

cohort was more strongly motivated by a desire to observe the crowds at the events than their attendee counterparts, the appeal of the telecasts may lie in the size of the crowds at the events and their diversity and the images that can be portrayed of them for telecast audiences to see.

The results have a number of implications for practice. They inform stakeholders, such as policy makers, as well as event marketers and managers, telecast planners, and sponsors, that there are significant differences between the two cohorts. Depending on the aim of each stakeholder group, resources can be allocated to facilitate enhancing the event experience for attendees at the events and for their telecast counterparts. In particular, the information garnered here can be used to inform marketing communications to assist in targeting audience members in each of the cohorts such as: 1) attracting new attendees at the events and audience members; and 2) potentially helping to “convert” members of the telecast cohort to become members of an attendee cohort in the future.

We recognize that the present research also has limitations. The data for our study were collected prior to the publication of Maeng, Jang, and Li’s (2016) meta-analysis of 46 published articles on event motivations. We note that Maeng et al. (2016) suggested that event motivations need to be revisited because those that have been adopted are predicated on tourism motivations rather than more specifically on event motivations. However, our findings indicate that Uysal et al.’s (1993) motivations resonated with respondents and using them provided a logical framework for this comparative analysis. Gaining the additional information about the levels of patriotism, which is an attitudinal construct we believe is highly relevant

to commemorative events we suggest, goes some way to addressing the potential concerns that Maeng and colleagues may have of the use of the already established measures for event motivations. Indeed, as heritage places and events are commonly utilized as tools to build nationalism and patriotism (Timothy & Boyd, 2006), including patriotism to profile consumers of events, such as that which was the focus in our study, has potential to advance our knowledge of these consumers considerably.

To date, the comparative analyses undertaken in relation to events have largely focused on attendees of a singular event, via segmentation studies, or across different types of events. To the best of our knowledge, there has not been any systematic comparative analysis of event attendees with their event telecast counterparts. This is surprising given the significant role that the telecasts of events play in the portfolio of the event market offering and the substantial role that the telecast plays in event planning and delivery. This research has made some progress in addressing this gap in knowledge but additional research in this area will assist to further close the gap. Although this study is based on data from Australia and New Zealand, as Anzac Day is commemorated in a number of countries, it would be useful to undertake comparative studies of event attendees and their telecasts participant counterparts in different parts of the world. Similarly, it would be useful to undertake research that focuses on physical and telecast audiences of other commemorative events. In this way, further information may be garnered about commemorative events in a holistic manner that considers both event attendees and telecast viewers, which can assist in product development, enhancing the event experience, no matter how that takes place, and innovations for event sustainability.

References

- Australian Broadcasting Corporation. (2015). *Anzac Day 2015: Record crowd gathers at Adelaide dawn service and march*. Retrieved from <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-04-25/record-crowd-at-adelaide-anzac-day-dawn-service/6420518>
- Backman, K. F., Backman, S. J., Muzaffer, U., & Mohr Sunshine, K. (1995). Event tourism: An examination of motivations and activities. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 3(1), 15–24.
- Balabanis, G., Diamantopoulos, A., Mueller, R. D., & Melewar, T. (2001). The impact of nationalism, patriotism and internationalism on consumer ethnocentric tendencies. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(1), 157–175.
- Birna, A., Hyde, K. F., Cheal, F., & Griffin, T. (2013). Pilgrims and patriots: Australian tourist experiences at Gallipoli. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 7(3), 227–241.
- Chalip, L., & Costa, C. A. (2005). Sport event tourism and the destination brand: Towards a general theory. *Sport in Society*, 8(2), 218–237.
- Cheal, F., & Griffin, T. (2013). Pilgrims and patriots: Australian tourist experiences at Gallipoli. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 7(3), 227–241.
- Chronis, A. (2005). Coconstructing heritage at the Gettysburg storiyscape. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(2), 386–406.
- Crompton, J., & McKay, S. L. (1997). Motivations of visitors attending festival events. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 426–439.
- Digance, J. (2003). Pilgrimage at contested sites. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 143–159.
- Durkheim, E. (1995). *The elementary forms of religious life*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Footo, K. E., & Azaryahu, M. (2007). Toward a geography of memory: Geographical dimensions of public memory and commemoration. *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, 35(1), 125–144.
- Frew, E., & White, L. (2015). Commemorative events and national identity: Commemorating death and disaster in Australia. *Event Management*, 19(4), 509–524.
- Frost, W. (2012). Commemorative events and heritage in former capitals: A case study of Melbourne. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 15(1–2), 51–60.
- Frost, W., & Laing, J. (2013). *Commemorative events: Memory, identities, conflict*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gantz, W., & Wenner, L. A. (1995). Fanship and the television sports viewing experience. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 12, 56–66.
- Getz, D. (1989). Special events: Defining the product. *Tourism Management*, 10(2), 125–137.
- Getz, D. (2007). *Events studies. Theory, research and policy for planned events*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- Green, B. C., Costa, C., & Fitzgerald, M. (2003). Marketing the host city: Analyzing exposure generated by a sport event. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 4(4), 48–66.
- Hall, J., Basarin, V. J., & Lockstone-Binney, L. (2011). Pre- and posttrip factors influencing the visitor experience at a battlefield commemorative event: Gallipoli, a case study. *Tourism Analysis*, 16(4), 419–429.
- Han, C. M., & Terpstra, V. (1988). Country-of-origin effects for uni-national and bi-national products. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 19(2), 235–255.

- He, J., & Wang, C. L. (2015). Cultural identity and consumer ethnocentrism impacts on preference and purchase of domestic versus import brands: An empirical study in China. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(6), 1225–233.
- Hede, A.-M. (2006). Mega-events and the “showcase” effect: Investigating the moderating influence of exposure to the 2004 Olympic Games telecast and interest in the Olympics—an Australian perspective. *International Tourism Review*, 10, 244–255.
- Hede, A.-M., & Hall, E. J. (2012). Evoked Emotions: Analysis of attendee experiences at Anzac Day events. In K. Hyde, C. Ryan, & A. Woodside (Eds.), *Field guide to case study research in tourism* (pp. 45–60). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Henderson, J. C. (2007). Remembering the Second World War in Singapore: Wartime heritage as a visitor attraction. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 2(1), 36–52.
- Hirsch, M. (2008). The generation of postmemory. *Poetics Today*, 29(1), 103–128.
- Hyde, K. F., & Harman, S. (2011). Motives for a secular pilgrimage to the Gallipoli battlefields. *Tourism Management*, 32(6), 1343–1351.
- International Olympic Committee. (2013). *Factsheet London 2013 & figures update*. Retrieved from https://stillmed.olympic.org/Documents/Reference_documents_Fact_sheets/London_2012_Facts_and_Figures-eng.pdf
- Katz, E. (1996). And deliver us from segmentation. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 546(1), 22–33.
- Keillor, B. D., & Hult, T. M. G. (1999). A five-country study of national identity: Implications for international marketing research and practice. *International Marketing Review*, 16(1), 65–84.
- Kim, S., Savinovic, A., & Brown, S. (2013). Visitors’ motivations in attending an ethnic minority cultural festival: A case study of the Fe ta Croatian Food and Wine Festival, South Australia. *Event Management*, 17(4), 349–359.
- Kim, W., Jun, H. M., Walker, M., & Drane, D. (2015). Evaluating the perceived social impacts of hosting large-scale sport tourism events: Scale development and validation. *Tourism Management*, 48, 21–32.
- Kosterman, R., & Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes. *Political Psychology*, 257–274.
- Lennon, J., & Foley, M. (2000). *Dark tourism: The attraction of death and disaster*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Lusk, J. L., Brown, J., Mark, M., Proseku, I., Thompson, R., & Welsh, J. (2006). Consumer behavior, public policy, and country-of-origin labeling. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy*, 28(2), 284–292.
- Machleit, K. A., Eroglu, S. A., & Mantel, S. P. (2000). Perceived retail crowding and shopping satisfaction: What modifies this relationship? *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 9(1), 29–42.
- Maeng, H. Y., Jang, H. Y., & Li, J. M. (2016). A critical review of the motivational factors for festival attendance based on meta-analysis. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 17, 16–25.
- Matheson, C. M., Rimmer, R., & Tinsley, R. (2014). Spiritual attitudes and visitor motivations at the Beltane Fire Festival, Edinburgh. *Tourism Management*, 44, 16–33.
- Mimouni-Chaabane, A., & Volle, P. (2010). Perceived benefits of loyalty programs: Scale development and implications for relational strategies. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(1), 32–37.
- Mowen, A. J., Vogelsong, H. G., & Graefe, A. R. (2003). Perceived crowding and its relationship to crowd management practices at park and recreation events. *Event Management*, 8(2), 63–72.
- Ritchie, B., Sanders, D., & Mules, T. (2007). Televised events: Shaping destination images and perceptions of capital cities from the couch. *International Journal of Event Management Research*, 3(2), 12–23.
- Rothenbuhler, E. W. (1988). The living room celebration of the Olympic Games. *Journal of Communication*, 38(4), 61–81.
- Russell, J. A., & Mehrabian, A. (1977). Evidence for a three-factor theory of emotions. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 11(3), 273–294.
- Ryan, C., & Bates, C. (1995). A rose by any other name: The motivations of those opening their gardens for a festival. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 3(2), 59–72.
- Santos-Lewis, R., & Moital, M. (2013). Constraints to attend events across specialization levels. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 4(2), 107–124.
- Sharma, S., Shimp, T. A., & Shin, J. (1995). Consumer ethnocentrism: A test of antecedents and moderators. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23(1), 26–37.
- Skoll, G. R., & Korstanje, M. E. (2014). Terrorism, homeland safety and event management. *International Journal of Hospitality and Event Management*, 1(1), 95–110.
- Slade, P. (2003). Gallipoli thanotourism: The meaning of ANZAC. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30, 779–794.
- Spilling, L. (1998). When do collective memories last? Founding moments in the United States and Australia. *Social Science History*, 22(4), 445–477.
- Timothy, D. J., & Boyd, S. W. (2006). Heritage tourism in the 21st century: Valued traditions and new perspectives. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 1(1), 1–16.
- Tkaczynski, A., & Toh, Z. H. (2014). Segmentation of visitors attending a multicultural festival: An Australian scoping study. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 14(3), 296–314.
- Turner, V. (1986). Dewey, Dilthey, and drama: An essay in the anthropology of experience. *The Anthropology of Experience*, 33–44.
- Uysal, M., Gahan, L., & Martin, B. (1993). An examination of event motivations: A case study. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 1(1), 5–10.
- Uzzell, D. L. (1989). *Heritage interpretation: The visitor experience*. Jackson, MS: Belhaven Press.

- Wang, C. L., & Chen, Z.X. (2004). Consumer ethnocentrism and willingness to buy domestic products in a developing country setting: Testing moderating effects. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 21(6), 391–400.
- White, G. M. (1997). Mythic history and national memory: The Pearl Harbor anniversary. *Culture & Psychology*, 3(1), 63–88.
- Winter, C. (2012). Commemoration of the Great War on the Somme: Exploring personal connections. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 10(3), 248–263.
- Yolal, M., Woo, E., Cetinel, F., & Uysal, M. (2012). Comparative research of motivations across different festival products. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 3(1), 66–80.